

***Remarks***

Reconsideration of claims 2, 4 and 5 is respectfully requested.

In the Office action dated May 26, 2004 (application Paper no. 11), the Examiner issued a Final rejection of pending claims 2, 4 and 5 under 35 USC 103(a). The Examiner's rejections will be discussed below in the order appearing in the Office action.

***35 USC § 103(a) Rejection - Claim 2***

The Examiner first rejected claim 2 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent 6,044,343 (Cong et al.) in view of US Patent 5,704,004 (Li et al.), both references of record. The Examiner stated that Cong et al. "teaches a method of generating speech code parameters in a bitstream based front end of a speech recognition system", Li et al. cited as teaching "thresholding and frame detection", with the conclusion that "it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of speech processing to modify the teachings of Cong et al...with thresholding and frame deletion because it would advantageously generate a new and shorter sequence of error-free vectors in order to save system processing time".

In response, applicants have amended claim 2 to specifically define the "threshold" as being "associated with an acceptable difference between the LSPs of the adjacent frames". In contrast, the "threshold" as disclosed by Li et al. is associated with performing speech compression on the transmission side of the system. These two types of threshold are considered to be distinct.

Thus, applicants assert that pending claim 2 is now allowable over the combination of Cong et al. and Li et al., and respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider this rejection.

***35 USC § 103(a) Rejection - Claims 4 and 5***

Claims 4 and 5 were next rejected by the Examiner under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cong et al. and Li et al. (as above), in further view of US Patent 6,230,124 (Maeda), where Maeda was cited as disclosing a system wherein error

detection is provided by using a check code created from “important” bits. However, the combination of Maeda with Cong et al. and Li et al. still lacks any teaching of a bitstream based speech recognition system as defined by claim 2, from which claims 4 and 5 depend. Without this teaching, therefore, applicants assert that claims 4 and 5, in their present form, are in condition for allowance.

In summary, the present case contains claims 2, 4 and 5, where claim 2 has been amended to particularly define the “threshold” used in the inventive method. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to review amended claim 2 and now find claims 2, 4 and 5 to be in condition for allowance. If for some reason or other the Examiner does not believe that the case is ready to issue and that an interview or telephone conversation would further the prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants’ attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Richard Vandervoort Cox et al.

By: Wendy W. Koba  
Wendy W. Koba  
Reg. No. 30509  
Attorney for applicants  
610-346-7112

Date: 7/12/04